UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspio.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/552,095	10/04/2005	David Harry Fortune	2308/560	4198
Edwin V Merke	7590 02/26/200	EXAMINER		
Nixon Peabody		DICKINSON, PAUL W		
Clinton Square P O Box 31051			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Rochester, NY 14603-1051			1618	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/26/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/552,095	FORTUNE ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	PAUL DICKINSON	1618			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	<b>\].</b> nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 Fe	ebruary 2007.				
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-53 and 64-67 is/are pending in the a 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) □ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-53 and 64-67 are subject to restriction	vn from consideration.				
Application Papers	_				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		=vaminer			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	• , ,	, ,			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents  2. Certified copies of the priority documents  3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior  application from the International Bureau  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive I (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)  1) ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) ☑ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) ☑ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5)  Notice of Informal P	ate			
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) 🔲 Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/552,095 Page 2

Art Unit: 1618

# **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Restriction

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted:

Group I, claims 1-30, drawn to a tissue-adhesive formulation.

Group II, claims 31-44, drawn to a sheet.

Group III, claims 45-52, drawn to a method for the manufacture of a sheet.

Group IV, claims 53 and 63-67, drawn to a method of joining a tissue surface.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

The common technical feature of the above groups is a formulation comprising a naturally occurring or synthetic polymerisable and/or cross-linkable material in particular form, the polymerisable and/or cross-linkable material being in admixture with particulate material comprising tissue-reactive functional groups. This element cannot be a special technical feature under PCT Rule 13.2 because it is not novel. US 6989192 teaches a formulation comprising cross-linkable polyacrylate particles in admixture with particles comprising a material comprising aldehyde groups (see entire document, specifically: abstract; col 2, line 50 to col 3, line 34). Aldehyde groups are

tissue-reactive functional groups. Since Applicant's inventions do not contribute a special technical feature when viewed over the prior art they do not have a single general inventive concept and so lack unity of invention.

#### Election

The first election requirement applies to Groups I-IV above. The second election requirement applies only to Group I above.

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

First Election Requirement of Two

Applicant is required to elect a species of tissue-reactive functional groups (see Claims 4-5 and 20)

The species are independent or distinct because claims to the different species recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. The different functional groups have different molecular structures and chemical behaviors. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

Second Election Requirement of Two

Applicant is required to elect whether or not the material that comprises the tissue-reactive functional groups is formed by derivatization of a polymer precursor (see Claim 8). If Applicant elects that the material is formed by derivatization of a polymer precursor, Applicant is further required to elect a specific polymer precursor, or a specific combination of polymer precursors (see Claims 10-13, 16, 19-20).

The species are independent or distinct because claims to the different species recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. The different polymer precursors have different molecular structures and chemical behaviors. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not

distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

# Rejoinder

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product

Art Unit: 1618

claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

# Inventorship Notice

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul W. Dickinson whose telephone number is 571-270-3499. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur 7:30 am - 5:00 pm.

Application/Control Number: 10/552,095 Page 7

Art Unit: 1618

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Hartley can be reached on 217-272-0616. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Paul W. Dickinson Examiner Art Unit 1618

February 18, 2008

/Michael G. Hartley/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1618